

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 16657 01 OF 02 101103Z

10

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 DODE-00

NSC-05 AID-05 CEA-01 COME-00 EB-07 FRB-03 CIEP-01

STR-04 LAB-04 SIL-01 /115 W  
----- 063940

R 101042Z OCT 75

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3539

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG

AMEMBASSY DUBLIN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

USNMR SHAPE

CINC EUR VAIHINGEN

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 BONN 16657

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MBFR, EC, GW

SUBJECT: EC-9 CONSIDERATION OF MBFR

SUMMARY: THE FRG IS A FIRM ADVOCATE OF DISCUSSION  
OF MBFR WITHIN THE EC-9. THE FRG MOTIVES  
ARE TO ASSURE THAT MBFR IS COMPATIBLE WITH  
EUROPEAN UNIFICATION, THAT THE EC REMAIN INVOLVED  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 16657 01 OF 02 101103Z

IN FORMULATING DETENTE POLICY AND THAT THE EUROPEAN

RESERVATION IN STANDING NATO GUIDELINES BE DEFINED.  
THE FRG SEES THE DISCUSSIONS IN THE EC AS FACILITATING THE NEGOTIATIONS IN VIENNA. END SUMMARY

1. THE AMBASSADOR ASKED FONOFF POLITICAL DIRECTOR VAN WELL OCTOBER 9, WHAT CONTRIBUTION THE FRG THOUGHT THAT THE EC COULD MAKE TO MBFR. THE AMBASSADOR TOLD VAN WELL THAT WE UNDERSTOOD THE FRG HAD ADVOCATED EC-9 DISCUSSION OF MBFR AND ASKED WHAT THE GERMAN MOTIVES WERE.

2. VAN WELL SAID THAT THE FRG HAD INDEED PRESSED FOR DISCUSSION OF MBFR BY THE EC POLITICAL DIRECTORS. THE FRG HAD THREE MOTIVES:

(A) ANY RESULT FROM THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS IN VIENNA MUST BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE POLICY OF EUROPEAN UNIFICATION. VAN WELL SAID THAT, IF THE FRENCH DESCRIBED THE RESULTS OF MBFR AS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE INTERESTS OF EUROPEAN UNION AND DEFENSE, THE RESULTS WOULD BE DISASTROUS IN THE FRG. HE CLAIMED THAT OPPOSITION TO MBFR WAS DEVELOPING IN THE FRG AND THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAD TO EXPECT ATTACKS AGAINST THE RESULTS OF THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS SIMILAR TO THE ATTACKS WHICH WERE MADE AGAINST GERMAN RATIFICATION OF THE NPT. VAN WELL SAID THAT THE FRG HAS FULL CONFIDENCE IN THE US. HOWEVER, THE EUROPEANS HAVE NOT YET DEVELOPED A EUROPEAN RATIONALE FOR MBFR. THERE ARE WIDE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG THE FRG, THE NETHERLANDS, AND THE UK. VERY BASIC QUESTIONS SUCH AS A SEPARATE CONTROL ZONE IN CENTRAL EUROPE AND TWO CATEGORIES OF MEMBERS IN THE EC (THOSE SUBJECT TO MBFR AND THOSE NOT) MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(B) MILITARY DETENTE (MBFR) IS BECOMING THE CORE OF POLITICAL DETENTE. IF CONSIDERATION OF MBFR WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE EC, IT WOULD MEAN A "DRYING UP" OF EC POLITICAL COOPERATION IN THE WHOLE FIELD OF EAST-WEST RELATIONS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 BONN 16657 01 OF 02 101103Z

(C) IN THE ORIGINAL NATO POSITION ON MBFR THERE IS LANGUAGE REFERRING TO THE "EUROPEAN RESERVATION." THAT IS, GUIDANCE STATES THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD NOT LEAD TO A HAMPERING OF EUROPEAN UNION AND EUROPEAN DEFENSE. THIS GUIDANCE HAS NEVER BEEN DEFINED. NATO IS NOT THE APPROPRIATE FORUM FOR DEFINING IT, BUT THE EC IS. THE FRG MBFR DELEGATION HAS PRESSED THE FOREIGN OFFICE FOR GUIDANCE ON THIS

POINT.

3. VAN WELL ASSURED THE AMBASSADOR THAT THE EC-9 HAS NO INTENTION OF PRODUCING A COMMON POSITION ON MBFR WHICH WOULD THEN BE INTRODUCED INTO THE NATO DISCUSSIONS. RATHER, THE GOAL OF DISCUSSIONS WITHIN THE 9 IS TO FORMULATE CERTAIN CRITERIA WHICH THE INDIVIDUAL 8 MEMBERS CAN THEN USE IN DISCUSSIONS IN NATO.

4. VAN WELL ALSO CLAIMED THAT THE DISCUSSION OF MBFR WITHIN THE 9 HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR A LONG TIME. HE ALSO CLAIMED THAT IT HAS HAD A POSITIVE BENEFIT. IN THIS CONNECTION, HE CITED THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT AND THE POSITION ON NO NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 BONN 16657 02 OF 02 101101Z

10

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 DODE-00

NSC-05 AID-05 CEA-01 COME-00 EB-07 FRB-03 CIEP-01

STR-04 LAB-04 SIL-01 /115 W

----- 063925

R 101042Z OCT 75

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3540

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG

AMEMBASSY DUBLIN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS  
USNMR SHAPE  
CINC EUR VAIHINGEN  
USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 02 BONN 16657

5. IN REPLY TO A QUESTION FROM THE AMBASSADOR, VAN WELL ASSERTED THAT THE EC DISCUSSIONS WILL NOT DELAY ATTAINMENT OF AN MBFR AGREEMENT. HE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE FRG POSITION ON THE INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III IS AN OVERLY COMPLICATED SERIES OF RESERVATIONS.  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 BONN 16657 02 OF 02 101101Z

THESE RESERVATIONS RESULT FROM UNCERTAINTIES ON THE PART OF THE FRG. THE EC CONSULTATIONS WILL HELP CLARIFY THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN OPTION III AND THUS LEAD TO REMOVAL OF MANY FRG RESERVATIONS, AND THEREFORE WILL SPEED THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS.

6. VAN WELL SAID THAT CHANCELLOR SCHMIDT AND FOREIGN MINISTER GENSCHER HAVE NOT REALLY FOCUSED ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF MBFR. THEY ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THEM AND LOOK TO VAN WELL TO KEEP THE NEGOTIATIONS UNDER CONTROL, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE EUROPEAN ANGLE. VAN WELL CLAIMED, IN EFFECT, THAT HE IS MAKING GERMAN POLICY ON MBFR.

7. COMMENT: WE BELIEVE VAN WELL IS OVERSTATING THE CASE IN PARA 5 ABOVE THAT EC-9 CONSULTATIONS WILL SPEED THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS. ON THE CONTRARY, WE CAN FORESEE THE POSSIBILITY THAT FRENCH OBSTRUCTIONISM MIGHT LEAD THE FRG AND/OR OTHER EUROPEAN STATES TO TAKE VERY CONSERVATIVE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE.  
HILLENBRAND

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, DETENTE, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, NUCLEAR WEAPONS, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 10 OCT 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** ElyME  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975BONN16657  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750352-1153  
**From:** BONN  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19751063/aaaacduu.tel  
**Line Count:** 212  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** ElyME  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 08 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <08 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <07 OCT 2003 by ElyME>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** EC-9 CONSIDERATION OF MBFR SUMMARY: THE FRG IS A FIRM ADVOCATE OF DISCUSSION  
**TAGS:** PARM, PFOR, GE, EEC, MBFR  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006